UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

What Does America Offer This Child? - - - - - - *Palmer Van Gundy*

Why a World Police? - *O. A. Hammand*

Emancipator of India - - *Leo Hirsch*

The Martyrdom of Martin Niemoeller - - - - - - *Stewart W. Herman*

Beauty I Have Known - *Gordon Caulfeild*

Religion—A Challenge - *Victor S. Yarros*

Observations on Europe - *Devere Allen*

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS

VOLUME CXXXIII NUMBER 6

Chicago, January-February, 1948

PRICE TWENTY-FIVE CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Bimonthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $1.50 Single Copies 25 cents

Published by The Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago 15, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter June 11, 1947, at the post office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of March 3, 1879."

CURTIS W. REESE, *Editor*

Contributors

Devere Allen: Editor-in-Chief of *Worldover Press.*

Gordon Caulfeild: Contributor to various rationalist journals.

Karl M. Chworowsky: Minister of the Fourth Unitarian-Congregational Society of Brooklyn, New York.

O. A. Hammand: Attorney at law and free lance writer.

Charles A. Hawley: Minister of the First Presbyterian Church, Atchison, Kansas.

Stewart W. Herman: Pastor of the interdenominational American Church in Berlin, 1936-1941; officer of the World Council of Churches in Switzerland, 1945-47; author of *The Rebirth of the German Church,* 1946.

Leo Hirsch: Free lance writer and lecturer.

Palmer Van Gundy: Formerly, Executive Director of the Los Angeles Chapter of the National Council for a Permanent F. E. P. C.

James M. Yard: Executive Director of the Chicago Round Table of Christians and Jews.

Victor S. Yarros: Attorney.

Contents

EDITORIAL—CURTIS W. REESE 103

ARTICLES—

What Does America Offer This Child?—PALMER VAN GUNDY. 104

Why a World Police?—O. A. HAMMAND 107

Emancipator of India—LEO HIRSCH 108

The Martyrdom of Martin Niemoeller—STEWART W. HERMAN .. 109

Beauty I Have Known—GORDON CAULFEILD 111

Religion—A Challenge—VICTOR S. YARROS 113

Observations on Europe—DEVERE ALLEN 114

THE STUDY TABLE—

Civil Rights—JAMES M. YARD 116

Priceless Document—CURTIS W. REESE 116

Horror, Heroism, and Haven—KARL M. CHWOROWSKY 116

Introducing Emily—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 118

WESTERN CONFERENCE NEWS 119

THE FIELD—

World Bill of Rights—*The Progressive Miner* 102

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

World Bill of Rights

A Bill of Rights submitted on behalf of the United States to the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, which held its second session in Geneva, Switzerland, December 1-19, 1947. The proposed declaration is as follows:

Proposal for Declaration

Whereas, by the Charter of the United Nations all members affirm their faith in the dignity and worth of the human person and pledge themselves to cooperate in promoting respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all,

Now, therefore, the General Assembly of the United Nations resolves to set forth in a solemn declaration these essential rights and fundamental freedoms of man and calls upon the peoples of the world to promote the rights and freedoms hereby proclaimed.

Article I. Everyone is entitled to life, liberty, and equal protection under law.

Article II. Everyone has the right to freedom of information, speech, and expression; to freedom of religion, conscience, and belief; to freedom of assembly and of association; and to freedom to petition his government and the United Nations.

Article III. No one shall be subjected to unreasonable interference with his privacy, family, home, correspondence, or reputation. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property.

Article IV. There shall be liberty to move freely from place to place within the state, to emigrate and to seek asylum from persecution.

Article V. No one shall be held in slavery or involuntary servitude. No one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel or inhuman punishment or indignity.

Article VI. No one shall be subjected to arbitrary arrest or detention. Anyone who is arrested has the right to be properly informed of the charges against him and to trial within a reasonable time, or to be released.

(*Continued on page* 115)

UNITY

Volume CXXXIII JANUARY-FEBRUARY, 1948 No. 6

EDITORIAL

After years of relatively peaceful cooperation on the part of Humanists and theists in the Unitarian fellowship there still bob up from time to time persons who either do not understand the nature of the Unitarian movement or who cannot accept the fact of freedom, reason, and tolerance as abiding principles, and who want to make of the Unitarian movement a Christian or a theistic sect. I have no fear that the Unitarian movement will establish a norm of orthodoxy, but I do fear that discussion of the issues involved will not be carried on at a level that will do credit to our reputation for intellectual competence.

For example, in a mimeographed and distributed sermon by one of our ministers, the author, in an effort to tie up Humanism and Communism in one neat little package, says: "This new Humanism accepts economic determinism as the key to the history of man, it proclaims: 'the charts were drawn long ago—man passes from feudalism through capitalistic industrialism and on to Communism.'" The last part of this statement is quoted from my *The Meaning of Humanism* but it is taken completely out of context and made to mean exactly the opposite of what I said. In the context it is perfectly plain that I was contrasting Humanism with both economic determinism and laissez-faire. There is no excuse for such garbling.

Again, in much of the discussion now going on the frame of reference is rarely made plain. It is one thing to discuss Humanism and theism in reference to organized Unitarianism. It is quite another to engage in speculative discussion of the relative merits of various theological and philosophical points of view. If the frame of reference is the organized Unitarian movement, then the appeal is to history, to the validity of Wilbur's statement of basic Unitarian principles, to the documents that govern Unitarian organizations, or to the spirit that constitutes the genius of the movement.

The contention of the Humanist, along with most theists, is that no particular theological or philosophical point of view has priority in the Unitarian fellowship. If this be granted, as I am sure it is by the overwhelming majority of Unitarians, then diversity of theological and philosophical positions becomes a matter of personal conviction or of intellectual speculation, and has no corporate significance.

But even in speculative discussion argument should be carried on in the context of current meaning. No Humanist is justified in discussing the position of Unitarian theists in terms that might be applicable to old-fashioned anthropomorphism, to the supernaturalism of the prescientific era, or to primitive animism. And by the same token, no theist should discuss Humanism in terms that would be appropriate only in discussing atheism, agnosticism, or old-fashioned naturalism. A sound principle of discussion is that one should distinguish between schools of thought that have superficial resemblance or even peripheral agreements.

In a recent statement by one of our ministers, Humanists are divided into three groups, described as atheistic, agnostic, and naturalistic. This leaves some of us who are commonly known as Humanists without a categorical home. If the term atheism still has any meaning it is an attitude of denial that the various types of theism account for the basic nature of the universe. In a sense each school of theism is atheistic in regard to other schools of theism. Specifically, Unitarian theists are atheists in regard to anthropomorphism. But my principal quarrel with the use of the term atheism in our theological discussions is that it has no relevance. The basic attitude of Humanism, as with all intelligent modern thought, is that of inquiry. In the course of inquiry there are tentative judgments and there are suspended judgments, but even these are incidental—the quest is the thing of central importance. Saying "atheistic Humanist" is comparable to saying "animistic theist" and is equally meaningless. The term atheism will doubtless continue to be hurled for emotive purposes at all sorts of Unitarians by archaic-minded people but it has no place in a discussion of the brethren in a free fellowship.

Agnosticism as a school of thought should not be equated with the tentative attitude of mind that is characteristic of the scientific method. In reality agnosticism is highly dogmatic. It knows so much about the nature of the universe that it knows the universe cannot be known. The only people today with whom we are concerned to whom the term agnostic might possibly be appropriately applied are the Neo-Calvinists and their Unitarian fellow-travelers, who appear to know so much about the nature of both man and God that they know man can never fully know God. It is

one thing to say that we do not know. It is quite another to say that we can never know. I have such faith in the ability of man and in the understandable nature of the universe that I am unwilling to set any limits to inquiry.

Even the term naturalism has ceased to have much distinctive significance in Unitarian circles. The term supernatural is taboo among us, and all things are natural. It is only in the realm of emotional or esthetic attitudes that some Humanists might be called naturalists and others not. All Humanists are at home in the "natural" world but some feel a bit more cozy than others.

Humanism centers attention on man, and it does not regard any particular cosmology as essential to religious living. Doubtless various cosmologies are religiously helpful to various people but the point is that no special one of them, such as theism, is essential. To believe that one particular interpretation of the nature of the universe is essential to religion is to foster bigotry and promote religious isolationism. Religion today must be larger than the patterns of any tribal or ethnic faith. The soul of man has many windows looking out upon varying scenes but no one of them gives a view of the total landscape.

But this is not to say that we are a group in which theists are Humanists, and Humanists are theists—that both proceed from the same presupposition. There are basic differences that should not be ignored. A minimum statement of the theistic position is that the nature of the universe is such that values are cosmically guaranteed despite hostile human forces. A maximum statement of Humanism is that the nature of the universe is such that human values may be progressively realized on the human level even in the face of hostile cosmic forces. Between these two positions there is a world of difference, and efforts to smooth over this difference do not enhance the clear thinking that is necessary for a virile philosophical position. Let us be fair with one another. Let us carry on our discussions in terms that are relevant today and let us welcome diversity; but let us not assume that we all mean the same thing when we say different things, nor should we assume that we mean the same thing even when we say the same thing. If only the term God is used it seems to satisfy many people, no matter what meaning is attached to it. Good theists would be well advised to be wary of persons who use the word but confuse the meaning. Clear thinking is a virtue that we should not neglect.

CURTIS W. REESE.

What Does America Offer This Child?

PALMER VAN GUNDY

Shy at first, baby Joan studied us thoughtfully from behind the folds of her mother's dress. These people Daddy and Mother were having picnic lunch with—were they friends or foes? Friends, Joan seemed to decide, for within the quarter hour she was entertaining my wife and me in the time-honored way of all bright three-year-olds since mother's shoes were invented for little girls to walk around in. The quick motion of the little legs, the incongruous bigness of the adult shoes on the tiny feet, the infectious laugh as she appealed to us for recognition. A child of obvious breeding and refinement, too, we observed a moment later as she politely waited her turn as the picnic lunch was served.

We felt instinctively that Joan was one of those children who would never lose her God-given charm in premature sophistication. She was a child to restore our faith in the American home. Looking at her as her father proudly fondled her, and observing the unusual intelligence and sensitivity in her expression, my wife and I were both struck with the same thought: What does American offer this child?

What an odd question, some might say. Is not America still America despite the politicians, high prices, post-war shortages? Does not America offer this child everything: political freedom, equality of economic opportunity? How lucky for Joan that she was not born in the shambles which is Europe, in caste-ridden India, in ancestor-haunted China! Where Joan was born it is personal worth, not ancestry, which counts. In the United States the dignity of the individual is still respected, and most people believe in granting to others the same rights and opportunities they expect for themselves. Of course, Joan will enjoy the chance to acquire a good education; to go as far with her education as she cares to or is able to go; to choose whatever vocation she may desire; or to marry and settle down in a nice little home in some pleasant neighborhood—in the suburbs perhaps—where there is plenty of light and air and grass for the raising of children as God intended them to be raised. Can we deny that her country offers Joan all these things?

Yes, we must deny it, although it makes us heartsick to do so. For we love America and all that is finest in the American tradition. There is a grave question whether Joan will receive those things which we have agreed are the birthright of every American. Her parents are denied them. They are denied their heritage despite the fact that their forebears have lived in the United States since pre-Revolutionary times. Whether or not Joan will receive her birthright depends on the extent to which America is able to outgrow her undemocratic past and to accept all of her citizens, no matter from whence they came, on a basis of true equality. Joan's ancestors came from a continent with one of the oldest known civilizations—Africa.

What does America offer this child? First among the rights of every adult American citizen is the right to vote. Will Joan be able to take her place at the polls when she reaches the age of twenty-one? Not if she

lives in certain parts of the South. It is not only Poland and Yugoslavia which stand in need of free elections. Even when we grant the progress which liberal forces are making against the poll tax and white primary, we must admit that too many of the states do not offer Joan the prospect of the same political freedom that they offer her white sister.

When Joan is a little older she will study a document in school which was signed by certain illustrious forebears of ours in protest against old world tyranny and discrimination. It was written as a Declaration of Independence from the traditional European idea that some persons are born to serve and others to be served. It affirmed the principle of equal opportunity and equal rights for all people in the classic lines now canonized as the American creed: "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness."

As a student, Joan may accept this statement at its face value. But as her experience deepens she may begin to be more analytical in her appraisal. "Life, Liberty and the Pursuit of Happiness," she might repeat. "My life is fairly secure. Still, death by violence occurs to women of my race as well as to men—merely because our color happens to be black. . . . Liberty? I have a form of liberty. But liberty is not *liberty* unless it is more than freedom from slavery. It must be freedom from want and from fear. Few of my people have achieved freedom from want. Fewer still have achieved freedom from fear. The Pursuit of Happiness —what does that mean? Surely it must mean that everyone should have an equal chance to be happy. That is only fair and reasonable. They say in America that there are no ceilings on achievement. They say that old world barriers of class and caste do not mean anything over here. They say it is the man himself or the woman herself who counts. I wonder how many Americans really *believe* in Americanism?"

Joan will not progress very far with her education before bitterly realistic answers to such questions will burn their way into her consciousness. The section of the country where Joan lives does not have openly segregated schools. It takes great pride in the fact that its schools are open to all without racial barriers. But are they really? True, unlike those in certain sections of the South, there are no "colored schools" with leaky roofs, antiquated textbooks, hopelessly underpaid teachers, receiving far lower pay than those who teach in "white schools." The absence of such obvious segregation cannot hide the fact that in Joan's state, however, segregation in education does exist. Joan lives in a colored neighborhood. Community pressure and the racial restrictive covenant have decreed that she may live nowhere else. Living in a colored neighborhood, she may attend a high school with a student body predominantly Negro.

Is there any possibility of escape from the spiritual isolation from the larger community which this segregated schooling brings? Well, her family may move to one of the fringe areas which surround her residential district and Joan may be enrolled in a white school. There in the white school she may escape for awhile, only to have some Fascist-or Communist-inspired student strike against Negroes drive her back behind the spiritual wall.

Even when she reaches the college level she will not be entirely free from discrimination in education. Privately endowed colleges will, in nearly all cases, admit her only on a rigidly limited quota basis. Some will not admit her at all. State universities will accept her more readily, but she will be barred from the social life of the institution. Many professional schools will not admit her. Others maintain severe quotas. So, in education as well as in politics, Joan will find that her full birthright as an American has been withheld.

If there is a yawning gap between promise and practice in the political and educational fields, in the economic the discrepancy is even more glaring. Joan will not be likely to meet the ugly specter of discrimination at its ugliest until she begins to look for a job. We have no idea what kind of position Joan is likely to be seeking twenty years from now. It is reasonably safe to assume that she will not be endowed with the voice of a Marian Anderson, the writing talent of a Richard Wright, the speaking ability of a Howard Thurman. In all likelihood she will be a regular girl—rather more intelligent than the average. Content to leave the winning of fame to the especially endowed, she may desire merely to have a job. If she does not essay to climb to the stage of Carnegie Hall, she may likewise not relish the prospect of spending her life scrubbing its steps. Let us assume that she may see a "help wanted" advertisement in the daily paper, placed there by the First National Bank. Let us assume that she decides to apply for this position.

What will be the result? By what standard will the personnel manager make his decision in Joan's case? Will he judge her by his own possibly prejudiced reaction to certain types of skin pigmentation? Will he judge her by what he believes other employes will think? By what he imagines the public will say? *Or will he judge solely by Joan's personal worth?* Surely for an American, there would be only one course open —to judge the girl entirely on her merits and qualifications for the job. To do less than this would be to deprive her of one of her most elementary rights as an American citizen—the right to work at the position she desires and for which she is qualified.

The effect on Joan personally is equally serious. To refuse Joan the work of her choice prevents her from using her talents to the fullest for the enrichment of the entire community. The denial of her right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness might embitter the young woman's whole outlook on life and sow in her mind the seeds of psychological malformations destructive of her own happiness and of her usefulness. Will Joan be deprived of her basic American right to be happy and useful?

Not, perhaps, if she lives in a city or state with Fair Employment Practices legislation. At present, however, few states and cities have such legislation. There is no Federal F.E.P.C. Without such a law Joan's chances of getting the bank job or any other decent job in most American cities would be slim indeed. In the city where she now lives as a child—a city of two million persons, many of them of her race—there are no Negroes employed by any bank in any capacity other than that of janitor or scrub woman. Even in the colored district, where the clientele of the bank is almost exclusively Negro, no Negro is employed as teller or clerk. Nor is this situation confined to banking. Except for a few church and welfare agencies, a

few government agencies, and a handful of industrial concerns and stores, the doors are closed to the Negro white-collar worker.

Suppose, however, that Joan chooses to become a unionized craftsman or an unskilled worker. Judging by present conditions, what chance has she to escape discrimination in these fields? A 7 per cent chance, in the city where she now lives. For 93 per cent of all job orders for unskilled and semi-skilled workers placed through the State Employment Service in her city are discriminatory against Negroes.

Whether or not Joan finds the right position, she will require some place in which to live. What opportunity does America offer Joan in the matter of finding a suitable home? Although I am white, I believe that personal experience has qualified me to answer that question; and that experience has taught me that she will have no freedom, or very little, in the choice of a residence.

I have had the privilege of visiting and of being entertained in a great many Negro homes of varying economic circumstances in a great many American cities and in rural areas. I have seen the upper-class Negro districts where freshly painted exteriors, charmingly designed interiors, and well-tended lawns and gardens reveal a valiant attempt to maintain standards despite the overcrowding which segregation invariably produces. I know the middle-class Negro districts in which neighborhood standards are kept up no better and no worse than they are in areas inhabited by white persons of comparable economic circumstances. I also know the Negro slums, which were white slums before they were turned over to Negroes. I am aware that in these slums white landlords customarily charge their colored tenants 30 to 250 per cent more for rents than was ever obtained from their former white tenants. The Negro is compelled to submit to this injustice because real estate restrictive covenants in other areas of the city keep him hemmed in and at the mercy of the white landlord. The underprivileged Negro is able to pay these excessive rents only because of overcrowding which is often excessive to the point of becoming inhuman. It is unreasonable to expect six Negro families to attain a high standard of culture and political development when those six families are forced to live in a flat that was previously occupied by one white family.

Fortunately for Joan she is not compelled to spend her childhood in the slums. Her home is in an area of the Negro district which is neither underprivileged nor privileged. It is an apartment much like millions of others in white neighborhoods. But it is situated in a part of the city which is overcrowded—every part of the segregated Negro area is overcrowded—and the time may come when Joan and her parents may desire to move to a less congested part of the community. Or perhaps when Joan marries she and her husband may wish to locate in one of those suburban tracts where trees, flowers, sunshine, and air provide a fit atmosphere for the raising of a family.

Surely this desire to move to the suburbs is in keeping with the American tradition. Yet Joan's normal attempt to gain a better life would be resisted with all the power of entrenched selfishness and bigotry of the white residents of the area. In the more exclusive districts, racial restrictive covenants would render her coming into the community impossible. In those areas where covenants had never been made or had expired or had proved ineffective, Joan might succeed in moving in. However, unless the community was already in the process of abandonment to Negroes, her coming would very likely be met with cold hostility, insult, and even, as a last resort, with violence and death. Some few isolated voices in some few churches, veterans' organizations, women's clubs, or other groups might speak out in Joan's behalf, but the great majority of persons in all these groups would either actively or passively resist her coming. They would resist her coming despite their supposed allegiance to the American principle of equal opportunity for all. They would resist her coming despite the service ideal of their clubs, and despite the Christian brotherhood principle and the Golden Rule to which their churches are supposed to be committed.

What is the cause of this almost universal failure of the white community to live up to its expressed ideals when they happen to come up against the problem of housing for the Negro? There are many causes, of course, but the one which underlies most of the others is ignorance. The bigoted white person believes that Joan's coming into his neighborhood would depress property values. The truth is that if there were no restrictions anywhere based on race *but only restrictions based on occupancy standards,* Joan's coming into the most exclusive neighborhood would have no effect whatsoever on property values.

When the white community comes to understand this, it will have no need to fear Joan's entry into its most exclusive areas. Moreover, it will have nothing to fear from the coming of any member of her group, no matter how ignorant or uncultured he may be. For, when there are no restrictions anywhere, the tremendous pressure radiating outward from the segregated district will be gone and there will be no possibility of a mass movement of any underprivileged group into any area. Only those Negroes who are able to pay normal prices for real estate will be able to buy in the white area. These will necessarily be the kinds of persons who, by reason of economic position, would be likely to have acquired the refinement which would make them a credit to the community. If it should be objected that some members of Joan's group lack her refinement no matter what their economic circumstances, it should be remembered that this is true of some persons in every group—white or black.

We have seen that America does not yet offer Joan the prospect of full citizenship in regard to voting, education, employment, and homemaking. Moreover, she faces second- and third-class citizenship in many other respects as well. At present the great majority of hotels, swimming pools, and vacation resorts, and many restaurants exclude members of Joan's race. Even some churches have been guilty of un-Christian exclusion and nearly all of them have failed to welcome Joan's group on a basis of equality.

Is there any hope that the America in which Joan is growing up may come to offer her the full citizenship which is her birthright? It depends a great deal on what the readers of this article and others of good will are willing to do to alleviate and remove the injustices which Joan's group now suffers. Here are a few simple suggestions for the citizen who would like to do his share to insure that little Joan will not be cheated of her heritage as an American.

1. Acquaint yourself with the basic facts about race. Read at least one book or pamphlet by a contemporary anthropologist on the subject of race. You will find that in the opinion of the anthropologists there are no superior and no inferior races—at least none whose superiority or inferiority can be proved. You will find that not only anthropologists but nearly all scientists of repute believe that it is environment rather than heredity which accounts for such differences as exist between culture groups. For example, in the Alpha and Beta tests given to all American soldiers in World War I white troops scored higher than Negro troops, but Negro troops from four Northern states averaged higher than white troops from four Southern states. It was not that the Negroes as a whole were inferior to the whites as a whole or that the Northern Negroes were superior to the Southern whites. The most reasonable explanation of the superior scores in each case lay in superior training resulting from superior environment. *Race, Science and Politics,* by Ruth Benedict, is a good book to begin with.

2. Acquaint yourself with the basic facts about the problem of Negro-white relationships in the United States. If you have the time and perseverence, read *An American Dilemma* by Gunnar Myrdal, the definitive work in this field. For the less scholarly reader, Margaret Halsey's *Color Blind* is ideal. Some may prefer one of the older but still priceless books, such as *Souls of Black Folk* by W. E. B. DuBois.

3. If you live in a community with a sizeable number of Negroes, invite a competent Negro speaker to address your club, lodge, or church. The director of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People or of the National Urban League in your city or a neighboring city would be glad to help you obtain the right speaker.

4. If you live in a community with a church which is racially inclusive in more than a token sense, attend its services. If you feel at home there, join it, or at least strive to make your own church more inclusive.

5. Form friendships across racial lines with persons with whom you have common interests. In so doing you will come to know individuals of the other group as *persons* rather than merely as representatives of the group.

6. Write to your representatives in Congress urging them to support the Ives-Chavez bill in the Senate and companion bills in the House for long-needed Fair Employment Practices legislation on a nationwide scale. This measure is based on two years' successful experience with F.E.P.C. in New York State.

7. Find out if there is a Council for Civic Unity in your city or other interracial committee for the furtherance of intergroup understanding. If there is such a group, support it. If not, use your influence for the formation of such a committee.

8. Refuse to sign racial restrictive covenants and refuse to purchase property restricted as to race. If you find that your property is already restricted, urge your neighbors to join with you in removing the restrictions.

9. If you are an employer, make it your practice to hire and fire and to upgrade and downgrade all employees solely on the basis of merit without respect to race or color.

10. If you are an employee, indicate your willingness to work with others, regardless of color or race.

11. As a customer, in so far as possible, trade only with firms which do not discriminate in their employment policy.

12. Believe in the future of America and do all in your power toward the realization of the American ideal of equal opportunity for all people in this generation.

If it is not possible for you to put into practice all of these suggestions, begin *now* to apply as many of them as you can. For only in so doing will you be helping to formulate a truly *American* answer to the question: What does America offer this child?

Why a World Police?

O. A. HAMMAND

Has the United Nations set up a police force yet? Has it made a disarmament plan? No, not so far. And do we understand that the two things are parts of the same problem?

If the armies and navies of Russia and the United States were eliminated, there would be very little difficulty in creating a police force. Those two nations make the danger which threatens the world. If they could get together intelligently and honestly and cut out all of the high-powered nationalism and reduce armaments, the police force and many other problems would be easy. But they are waiting for the boiling kettle to cool while at the same time building the fire. If we had a world police force at the present time would it do us any good? Not a bit. We could not agree what to do with it and in our present status it would just add to our suspicion and fear.

If we build of iron or steel we can proceed as rapidly as we are able to work, for we know just what strain the material will stand and just what the machine will do. We can stop at any time and repair the machine with no danger and little delay. But when we work with the human element—human philosophy and human psychology—and construct social and political machinery, we must work in another way.

In the beginning every world organization is working under a great strain, the forces promoting it going just as far as possible for them to go without a break: and the resisting forces stopping at the point where they refuse to concede anything more. This was true in the Articles of Confederation, in the Constitution, and in the League of Nations. Each one of these three started out as a very weak organization but all of them grew very rapidly.

The absence of a police force at this premature stage of world understanding and agreement is a political asset and security factor. It is only when we are able to control power and use it for democratic purposes that it serves the cause of mankind. Blind power permits the abuse of power which is the essential of totalitarianism. Let us give the United Nations time to grow and develop in a democratic way, for what it needs is not more rules or more teeth, but more confidence and understanding.

Emancipator of India*

LEO HIRSCH

The Indian ideal of sainthood comes from the *Bhagavad-Gita,* meaning the Song of the Lord. "To those who are detached from desire and from anger, who practice self-control and are restrained in mind, knowing the true self—to them is salvation nigh."

It is in the blending of this idealism of India with that of Christianity that Mahatma Gandhi is to be understood. Mahatma means "great soul" and the title is India's recognition that in him her ideal of sainthood is realized. This distinction came to him unsought; and when he was asked by members of the English Parliament what the title meant, he replied: "It means a very unimportant person." Such humility is of the essence of sainthood, and it is by identifying himself with the poor that he has won his great eminence in India. A saint is one who makes the spiritual world visible to us; and this will help to explain the vast multitudes who come to gaze at the homely and humble figure of the Mahatma as a religious exercise. Here is a man without wealth or earthly possessions, rather sickly and emaciated, yet possessing a spiritual grandeur, whose influence has affected 400 million human beings.

Like Dr. Kagawa in Japan, Gandhi is a fighting pacifist, and his long and heroic career has been spent in a great attack upon race prejudice and the exploitation of the poor. The conviction was burned into his soul that India had been and still is being killed, body and soul, by exploitation from abroad.

Some of Gandhi's sayings upon the central principles of his life have become classical. They are: "If untouchability and caste are convertible terms, the sooner caste perishes, the better for all concerned." "If blood must be shed, let it be our blood." "Passive resistance is always infinitely superior to physical violence." "There is no God higher than Truth." "Truth is the first thing to be sought for, and beauty and goodness will then be added unto you; that is really what Christ taught in the Sermon on the Mount."

He profoundly believes in non-violent resistance which came to him from that great American, David Henry Thoreau, who expressed it over one hundred years ago. Non-violence does not mean weak submission to the will of the evil-doer but rather the putting of our whole soul against the will of the tyrant. It is in fact another name for love—opposing itself with courage to physical violence and opposing truth to untruth.

Gandhi also believes in fasting. This is a discipline of soul and body and has rarely been understood in the Western world. When he enters upon a long fast, it is because he believes that his followers need to be lifted to new moral heights and that, in their failure, he himself has failed. His genius as a leader comes from the fact that he leads such opposing forces as the Mohammedans and Hindus, as well as the Untouchables. These conflicting forces continue those riots which seriously disturb the peace of India and make progress difficult. Whenever these riots became serious, Gandhi would fast and in each case he won a temporary victory by first winning a victory in his own soul. On the other hand, when he fasted as a prisoner of the British, he unquestionably used a form of non-violent resistance.

He often confessed during these riots that his followers were not yet ready for the full exercise of soul force. Despite such failures, he has worked miracles in the reshaping of the soul of India. His amazing success has been that he has changed India from a slave mentality of acquiescence to a fearless expression of revolt and, at the same time, he has harnessed the fury of the mob. He has kindled the flame of freedom and independence and yet prevented a conflagration. He has won an immense victory without force, without war, and without money, in so far as he has compelled the British Empire, after two hundred years of occupation, to withdraw her troops and restore the independence of India. He wrote the Declaration of Independence for India. Gandhi has declared the Emancipation of the Untouchables, liberating 60 million human beings from actual persecution and slavery. This is the greatest deliverance in human history. (The other emancipations were the freeing of 23 million Russian serfs by the Russian Czar, Alexander II, March 2, 1861, and the freeing of the Negro slaves by Abraham Lincoln.)

Gandhi has also brought about the emancipation of women, and that, too, was a miracle of social reformation when it is remembered that for many centuries women had no real place in Indian life apart from domestic duties.

Gandhi believes that the machine with its mass production has brought to man neither freedom nor happiness. He insists that only partnership, brotherhood, and love can win for us the release of our spiritual forces. Einstein confirms this universal truth when he says: "There is partnership between time and space," and biology recognizes that the successful insects and animals are the cooperative ones. Gandhi's attitude is the spirit which recognizes the supreme value of personality and of freedom. In the industrial world, we are witnessing the result of placing the machine above man, and we will yet learn through bitter experience that the human values are the real values. We will yet learn the lesson that it is impossible to keep our machines in full operation, and their product in constant consumption, unless the profits of industry are shared in ever-increasing ratio with the men who operate the machines and who are the mass consumers. Partnership is the only principle that justifies the machine. Workers the world over are demanding not charity but partnership, not patronage but justice. America became great because here, for the first time in human history, the common man became the measure of all values. This religious ideal is at the heart of Dr. Kagawa in Japan, Gandhi in India, and it motivated our American saint, Abraham Lincoln.

We of the Western world, trying to recover our sanity and stability after the most destructive war in history, wounded, weary and confused, yearning for a permanent peace and yet divided and incapable of achieving it, look wistfully and hopefully to Gandhi as the incarnation of a moral and spiritual power and as the embodiment of principles which offer to the race moral substitutes for war and a challenge to luxury, selfishness, and greed.

*Since this article was written, Gandhi has been assassinated. Later, UNITY will issue a Gandhi Memorial number.—*C. W. R.*

The Martyrdom of Martin Niemoeller

STEWART W. HERMAN

Few people, if you inquire closely, possess a clear impression of the man Niemoeller, although millions of Germans, Americans, Swiss, British, Belgians, Dutch, and even some Norwegians have seen him and heard him speak since the end of the war. At fifty-five years of age he has become a legendary figure, not because the facts of his life are unobtainable, but because his name is hopelessly entangled in everybody's feelings about Germany. The Dahlem parson is a part of the "German problem" and, whether he likes it or not, has become the hero of the legend of a Good Germany, just as Adolf Hitler was the villain of the legend of a Bad Germany. For those who prefer to discard the Good Germany legend, Niemoeller is simply one of the lesser villains of the Nazi drama.

Where is the truth? Is Niemoeller a genuine martyr or is he a "myth"? Is he really a victim of Nazi persecution or nothing more than a Fascist at heart who merits no particular sympathy for spending eight years in concentration camp? Is it true that he is anti-Semitic? Is it true that he offered his services to Hitler when the war broke out? If not, is he a convinced democrat *à la* American or is he just another German nationalist, a patriotic Prussian who cannot forget that he commanded a U-boat when Hitler was only a corporal?

As a matter of fact, what kind of Christian is he? There were rumors that he had become a Roman Catholic. Is he actually Lutheran or Reformed, or is he trying to start a new united denomination on the basis of the *Bekennende Kirche* (Confessing Church)? Is he really preaching repentance, or is that just for outside consumption?

Most of these questions can be answered very briefly by those who have even a passing acquaintance with Martin Niemoeller.

I have watched Niemoeller closely since I became pastor of the American Church in Berlin early in 1936, and I have been in close contact with him since his release. I have seen many skeptical people meet Niemoeller for the first time, but I have never known one of them to leave him with the feeling that the man was a sham. It cannot be denied that he has made mistakes and that these mistakes help to explain the "bad press" he has had, but it is also true he is today being more effectively—if not so painfully—persecuted now than he was under the Nazis. Indeed, there seems to be a deliberate campaign of psychological warfare directed against any revival of the whole German Church.

Niemoeller admits many things, including the fact that his misguided vote helped to bring Hitler to power. Addressing the university students at Gottingen in January, 1946, he described how he got up and walked out of church service in 1918 because the preacher said that Germany had been guilty and deserved the defeat which had been sustained. He admits that he placed his hope in the rise of a German "hero" who would smash the Treaty of Versailles. But he went on to say that a German now need only to stand in front of the incinerator at Dachau, with its inscription to the 238,756 people who perished there, in order to comprehend the extent of the nation's guilt today. This changed man knows that most Germans will close their eyes to these ugly facts if they can and he is determined that they shall not do so.

Niemoeller, back in 1938, was one of the first to have his eyes opened, and he spent eight years as Hitler's personal prisoner because he opposed the whole Nazi program, not just a part of it. This point has escaped Mrs. Roosevelt and others who have not troubled to consider what was meant when the pastor said that he did not resist Nazism on political grounds, but on religious grounds. That is to say, he rebelled as a Christian and not merely as a German citizen. He had come a long way in the fifteen years since that church service at Bethel when his German "honor" had been offended by a Christian preacher!

He is, however, a patriotic German. He is a nationalist in the same sense that thousands of American pastors, who claim to be internationally-minded, are nationalistic. But he is also one of the few genuine democrats I have met in Germany. He is convinced that Germany's salvation must rise up from the people, not be legislated down from the government. He applies this principle rigidly to the reorganization of the church, saying that the new church must be built on the elected representatives of the local congregation, not on bishops or superintendents appointed at the top. When he was recently selected head of the Church of Hessen, he refused to take the title of Bishop. He is one of the most ardent advocates of strong lay-leadership in the church because he knows that clergymen alone are feeble. And he is the most persistent preacher of popular repentance, although it is a very unpopular message just now. "We have discovered," he said in Geneva, "that sin and guilt are not merely words and empty symbols . . . but terrible matters of fact and reality."

That does not mean that the Christian pastor has become a democratic politician or is lecturing on the superior values of Anglo-American government. He still takes his political stand for "religious reasons" just as he did in Hitler's time. He judges political and economic practices not by their effect on the church as an institution but by their conformity with moral law (the Ten Commandments) and the Christian Gospel. Incidentally, he has said that a state which is based only on the Ten Commandments is out of date today! This standard is so severe that it constantly gets Niemoeller into trouble with his fellow Christians, to say nothing of his difficulties with the secular press which frequently misunderstands what he is trying to say.

It is nonsense to maintain that Niemoeller and his friends have entered into a political alliance with the Social Democrats of Germany to combat the influence of the Roman Catholic Church. That is the latest charge against him. The facts are these: the newly-reorganized Protestant Church of Germany has been working closely with Christian laymen in all walks of life with a view to insuring, if possible, the Christian character of a "new Germany." In several provinces special institutions have been set up for this purpose, and at Bad Boll, for example, an Academy has been established to which a new group comes each fortnight. There are "retreats" for lawyers, physicians, re-writers, farmers, labor union leaders, students, and governmental officials.

They are led to consider what they in their particular vocation can contribute to a Christian renewal which will not merely confine itself to increased church attendance but a seven-day week of Christian life and work.

In line with this new program, which has proved to be an enormous success in the ideological vacuum of Germany, church leaders have found that their counsels are welcome and they have been meeting with leading personalities of the post-war period. It is indeed interesting that the Social Democrats who used to be very anti-clerical now see the importance of religion. But there is not the slightest thought of pairing off with Protestantism against Catholicism, which is likewise enlisting laymen in the cause of Christian renewal. Both Churches are aware of their responsibility for Germany's future development away from National Socialism. Was it not we who freely accused the German Church of being too "otherworldly"?

German churchmen are of two minds about the "Christian Democratic" parties which have emerged in strength since V-E day. Undoubtedly, many politicians of the old Catholic Zentrum party have gravitated into positions of leadership, thus making the new party in certain districts almost entirely Roman Catholic. But the main problem for most pastors and priests consists in deciding whether the church should back political parties at all, and most clergymen think it is unwise to do so. The job of the church, they believe, is to provide basic Christian guidance for all citizens regardless of party affiliations. Thus, Protestant leaders have been meeting with leaders of various parties and will continue to do so. The Niemoeller who lived for many months with Catholic priests at Dachau has not the remotest notion of inaugurating a political crusade against Rome.

To illustrate the vicious nature of anti-Niemoeller propaganda it is sufficient to point out that the hardy parson is likewise alleged to be toying with the idea of conversion to Catholicism! Nothing could be more ridiculous and one is at loss to understand how this old rumor ever originated, unless the Nazis deliberately launched it in the vain hope of breaking the spirit of the Confessing Church which kept right on fighting after its leader was imprisoned.

Who has now launched the tasty tidbit that Niemoeller is anti-Semitic? "Evidence" was produced at Nürnberg to the effect that Rosenberg interceded for Niemoeller's life on this basis! Does it not seem strange that, while refusing to believe Nazi accusations against prominent people of a dozen countries, we are now asked to believe that one of Nazidom's best liars is at last giving us the secret truth about Niemoeller?

But Niemoeller made another mistake when he told American reporters last year that there is no more anti-Semitism in Germany. There is, in fact, plenty of it lurking in the breasts of many Germans. Perhaps he meant to say that anti-Semitism is no longer Germany's official policy. That is quite possible, when you account for a difference of languages which so often leads—as at Naples—to serious misunderstandings. However that may be, it is Niemoeller who today goes up and down his country telling his large audiences that their first request for forgiveness must be directed to their Jewish brethren. "If I meet today a Jew whom I have known in the past," he told a Frankfort audience, "I, as a Christian, cannot do anything else but say to him: 'My dear friend, here I am before you. I have sinned and my people have sinned against your people and yourself'."

Moreover, it was Niemoeller in 1933 and 1934 who protested against the very first signs of racial discrimination which made Jews "second-class citizens." It was the Confessing Church which refused to repudiate Christian Jews, even when certain cautious clergymen were privately suggesting to non-Aryan members that perhaps it would be advisable for them to stop coming to the public services. It was not in Dachau that he first saw the light.

Niemoeller made another mistake when he applied for membership in the Association of Nazi Persecutees, which has turned out to be a pressure group of doubtful virtue. One good reason for such an organization is that it provides a kind of check on the concentration camp "alumni" by requiring documented evidence for membership in the society. On the other hand, it inevitably fell prey to some of the same evils which afflict the American Legion, for instance, whereby a badge of honor is issued for public blackmail. I do not know why Niemoeller even applied, but another pastor told me that he himself took a prominent part in the local chapter in his city because there was great danger of the Association being dominated entirely by Communists. He felt he had to demonstrate that the Communists were not the only objects of Nazi persecutions, much as he disliked to bother with the time-consuming duties of this strange fraternity.

The political leadership of the Association let the cat out of the bag when it said that Pastor Niemoeller "during his recent visit to the United States did not describe the situation in Germany with the proper seriousness that should be expected today from any political or racial persecutee." In other words, members will be judged not only by what they did under Hitler, but also by what they do now! Aside from the fact that the sole condition of Niemoeller's American visit was a strict injunction by the State Department against speaking about anything outside of religion, Niemoeller would certainly not have taken directives from the concentration camp "lobby."

They also accused him of receiving thousands of food parcels, not one of which went to a genuine "persecutee." Nothing is said about the fact that the officially recognized victims of persecution—while by no means well off—have received preferential treatment in all matters of food, rationing, housing, etc.

It is well-known that Niemoeller has encountered hostility in the town of Budingen where he has been residing ever since his release. He and his family occupy some rooms in the ancient castle of an outstandingly devout Christian family. Housed in the huge structure are dozens of other refugees, most of whom bear ponderous titles of nobility. Beggars cannot be choosers when it comes to lodgings, but Niemoeller's neighbors have not made him popular with some of the townspeople. When Martin Luther found refuge in the Wartburg in the sixteenth century, the proletariat was not so self-conscious as in the day of this modern Martin.

At least one prominent personality resigned publicly from the Persecutees' Union when she heard that Niemoeller was not accepted. She was Martha Sevenich, a political figure in that same Christian Democratic Union against which Niemoeller was reported to be

plotting with the Social Democrats! She added that she was happy to have such a man as Niemoeller representing Germany in foreign countries because she was sure he would do so from a Christian conscience.

Is he a martyr or is he a myth? He certainly is no myth, but even his closest friends hesitate to say that he is a martyr. After all, he is still alive. By definition, martyrs are men and women who not only suffer but perish for their faith. The Dahlem pastor would pose no problem if he were dead. As he is not, there are some people who seem to feel that there is something wrong with him. Indeed, Christians find it rather uncomfortable and embarrassing to have him alive. There is an unearthly quality about Niemoeller that makes him unforgettable. You have the feeling that this is a man who has descended into hell and it would have been more appropriate for him to ascend into heaven instead of returning to earth. Moreover, you cannot escape the gnawing notion that his descent had something to say to you personally.

Thousands of Hitler's prisoners have survived the concentration camps only to be forgotten as swiftly as the nameless dead whose bodies were thrown into huge pits and covered with lime. That is another reason why the living need a "union," but Martin Niemoeller needs no union membership. His chief difficulty is that his faith grew into an enormous rock which has become a "stone of stumbling" for many people, not least of all the non-Germans who unconsciously rebel at the idea that so important a victim of Hitler was actually a German. His German-ness is almost as revolting as the Jewishness of Jesus was to the Nazi-Christians.

The ex-sub commander now knows that he also made a mistake in offering his services to the German Navy but in 1939 he had already spent more than two years behind barbed wire and his lawyer urged the action upon him to avoid being slaughtered when the camps were liquidated. It was rumored that all political prisoners would be killed to save food for the war effort. Niemoeller finally followed the suggestion for a variety of reasons, none of which was designed to help the Nazi cause. I discussed the whole matter with him, and the American Army has a complete transcript of the garbled interview at Naples. Suffice it to say that, if you bluntly ask Niemoeller whether he really wanted to help Hitler win the war, his face grows taut and his eyes strike sparks as he almost shouts, "A thousand times, No!" What he really wanted was to help gird the church for the spiritual crisis which was to come.

Now that crisis is upon the German Church. The Dahlem pastor is a walking-talking reminder that appeasement and compromise with religious convictions lead straight to death and disaster. He is still Germany's Jeremiah, and his martyrdom consists not in the fact that he is a graduate of Dachau but that he is still alive. From a purely human and selfish point of view, that is probably his biggest mistake.

Beauty I Have Known

GORDON CAULFEILD

As we go our way through life, we occasionally encounter those rare events which at the time so vividly impress us with their beauty in one form or another that forever afterwards the glow of their memory lights our life. Gradually life becomes so much finer and richer for all these accumulated memories of the beauty that is to be found in our world. And we learn at last to appreciate what a magnificent treasure we may collect for ourselves in the storehouse of our own mind. A treasure nothing can ever take from us.

Nature is one of the things which has the power to affect us strongly. When I was a small boy I used to spend the summer with my parents at our summer home in the beautiful lake district of Muskoka in Ontario. Our cottage was close beside the water and even now I remember so well waking up in those early mornings and drinking in the clear, sparkling beauty of the sun's rays dancing and glancing in a thousand bright gay points across the cool, rippling waters. Though I cannot explain exactly why, I have always recalled this scene of nature's glory with a warm glow of emotion. There was something about the sun sparkling on the water, and the whole world just waking up and yet still quiet, and the fresh wonder of life to young boyhood, that thrills and delights the whole consciousness. Deep down within us we must be very closely attuned to nature, we humans, to be affected so by her moods and harmonies.

Sometimes human actions affect us strangely and leave us wondering for the rest of our lives. One day years ago I was walking with a group of other young people on one of those interesting rambles through the open country which are such a refreshing experience to city dwellers. Wandering along, we came of a sudden upon a fine collie dog which had just been struck by a handcar going down the railway tracks. Although he was not dead but only injured, the callous men had left him lying there beside the rails. Other people were also walking by, and one young girl, a stranger to our group, ran over at once to the dog. She dropped down on her knees beside the collie, and I shall always remember the great tenderness and evident feeling and concern with which that young girl lifted up the dog's injured leg and examined it. I am not being sentimental about it, but there was some quality so fine and so touching and so inspiring about this girl's emotion and simple act of kindness that it left one realizing what a really powerful force kindness can be and what strong reactions it can create in fellow humans. Such gentleness is comparatively rare in our times, but contemplation of such gentleness is a perpetual source of renewal of faith in human nature. Thinking of that girl's kindness, there surges up anew within me a deeply vital feeling of the essential worth and dignity of human life. And let no cynic ever dare deny this quality of kindness, for those actions in life which are harmful to humans have no such power to rouse and inspire us so to our depths.

Yes, kindness can sometimes become a rare and precious and never-to-be-forgotten beauty. The kind

and the gentle and the beautiful seem inevitably to go together. I have often heard it said, for instance, that florists who are continually living and working among the fragrant beauty of flowers are generally gentle-natured people, and I have observed for myself that this is quite true. Perhaps every wife-beater should be sentenced to grow a beautiful flower garden.

One evening long ago I recall seeing a young man come up to a poor old fellow huddled in a shop doorway on a busy city street and selling shoelaces and other little odds and ends. You could tell at once from his unusually kind face that the young man was going to buy something. And I have often regretted that I did not seize the opportunity of making his acquaintance, for he was one of those rare people that you knew you would want for a friend. There was something very beautiful about this man's simple act of kindness which gave you a greatly strengthened belief in the ultimate goodness of life. You felt instinctively that if there were more people in our world as thoughtful of others as he was, it would indeed be a different home for humanity.

The face of a little child may often be one of the most moving things in all life. There is a beauty so rare and haunting in the features of a really lovely little girl or boy that it tugs at your heartstrings as perhaps nothing else can ever do. Occasionally in my life I have seen such children. I remember one time arriving on the scene of a motor car accident just after the unfortunate victim had been removed. Then by chance shortly after this I happened to meet an unusually lovely little girl about five years old. And the appalling thought suddenly struck me: "That child! Crushed, mangled, killed by a car!" The realization of the terrible possibility that the life of that most precious and adorable little child might sometime be wiped out by some careless driver left a very vivid impression upon my mind. At the time I was a young man about twenty, but this single impression did more than anything else to temper my future driving with a new regard for the value of human life. Young children are such sensitive little creatures and react so easily and so strongly to their environmental influences. We grownups should try as much as is humanly possible to surround our children with every form of beauty.

And there is a very vital relationship between the beauty of a woman and other beauty. Will Durant, in summing up the opinions of others, has written that woman's beauty is to humans the one primary standard by which they naturally judge all beauty: we admire soft, round curving objects for instance because they remind us of woman's beauty. But humanity generally has yet to learn and to fully realize this deep solemn truth. Too often today woman's beauty is viciously and cruelly exploited. And I believe, since in this way the one vital essence of all that is beautiful is not respected and cherished, lesser forms, too, are automatically neglected. Thus far too much of our cities are desolate wastes of sinister ugliness.

Reverence for woman and her beauty is closely akin to reverence for human life itself. And human life achieves true beauty only when it attains full reverence: only when human life is respected and loved for its true innate worth and dignity. It is the abuse and misuse of this precious worth and dignity of human life which is so sordid and ugly—and so mentally depressing. We hear much of the mechanical wonders and the magic technological achievements of the world of tomorrow. But these will be as nothing in their effects upon human living when compared to the rich reverence for human life which will abound everywhere. This reverence will and must come about if there is to be any real human progress at all. In tomorrow's society there will be a whole new mental climate. But, today, love holds the closest vision of the future. When a man and woman truly love, when the life and being of each is utterly and completely adored and precious to the other, then reverence for life reaches its very highest pitch of perfection.

And when one of two who truly love loses the other in death, no other heart knows nor can ever know such indescribable anguish. Novelists, who sometimes are said to be among the best psychologists, often portray this well, as does Francis Brett Young in his book *Love Is Enough,* when he shows so vividly the terrible and utter desolation of Clare at Ralph's young death.

Such great reverence for one human life cannot help but have beneficial effects upon one's feeling for all human life. I dare to predict that psychologists will find the effects of natural love upon human feeling, and also this quality of human feeling itself—so intangible and yet as real as steel—to be of the most vital importance in human personality.

One surpassing happiness in life can come from the beauty of mental peace, the peace that comes to those who know they have not wittingly harmed or injured any one of their fellow humans.

There is of course the beauty of music with which great composers have enriched our lives. Beautiful waltzes, famous classic airs, great symphonies upon which the finest composers have lavished their highest genius, are universally admired. And yet my one favorite musical composition is Mexico's own "Home, Sweet Home," the simple yet exquisitely beautiful "La Golondrina." I never hear this song but that I am filled with an indescribable elation and sense of the ultimate beauty of life. There are many beauties in life. The sad truth is that too few today appreciate beauty. We do not today come naturally through our societal influences to a realization of beauty; we learn it from our parents or else for ourselves. Its precious essence seeps into our being through long and intimate contact with it when we leave our cities to go into nature's country. Nature is so beautiful, so very beautiful. Often have I thought: Let this beauty flow richly and deeply into our lives, making them in turn more beautiful.

This power of beauty to inspire us springs from the very nature of our earth itself, so abundantly pregnant with beauty. Wherever I go on this beautiful earth of ours, I find only more reason for believing in the intrinsic beauty and dignity of life and in the power of a rational outlook on life. All the noblest and most beautiful potentialities in life always and continuously are there crying out to us not to ignore nor injure them. Beauty can be a bright flaming passion, ever haunting us, taunting us, calling us on. We have today not nearly enough simple downright beauty in our lives. Let us, with force and feeling, power and purpose, and yet withal joyously, take hold of life for the magnificent adventure that it is and create for the sheer ecstatic happiness of ourselves and our children a world of great beauty.

Religion—A Challenge

VICTOR S. YARROS

Agnosticism is known to be widespread, even though hosts of people will not call themselves Agnostics, because they wish to be considered respectable by the conventionally religious. But the Agnostics do not seem to be as aggressive, as militant, as their spiritual forbears were in the last decades of the nineteenth century, in the days of Spencer, Huxley, Tyndall, Leslie Stephen, and other eminent thinkers of the same high rank. Indeed, there has been much talk in certain circles of an alleged revival of orthodox religion. One recent work asserted that the Western man is now "rediscovering his soul"—so long apparently forgotten under the influence of science—and in his bewilderment and anxiety is turning to the Bible and the God of the Bible.

There is doubtless not a little wishful thinking in this talk about a religious revival. After all, if science has failed to prevent the terrible world wars and the recrudescence of barbarism in Europe and Asia, religion has equally failed in that mission. If science is bankrupt, so is religion. What reason is there for believing that religion will be more successful and effective in the future than it has been in the past?

The average adherent of Judaism or Christianity will say, of course, that science has no ethical message for us, whereas religion has, and the trouble is that we have not really taken that message to heart, have not sincerely tried to live up to it in our politics and economics. This answer appears plausible to many, but it is no answer at all. In the first place, as the writer has heretofore contended, the social sciences have an ethical message and do seek to shape and direct our conduct. It is absurd to affirm that economics, ethics, psychology, history, and philosophy are morally "neutral," and have no principles or ideas designed to promote the good life. The opposite is demonstrably true. In the second place, granting that rulers, diplomats, and statesmen often ignore or flout the injunctions of ethics, is their attitude toward religious commands and principles different? What has religion had to do with international relations, war, and peace treaties?

Undeniably, science alone cannot save civilization or insure progress in any field other than the physical and technological. Good will is as essential as intelligence and knowledge. To do the right thing, it is necessary to *will* the right thing. That there is too little good will in the world is tragically true. Our civilization is a very thin veneer. The most poignant of all questions is: How can we increase the amount of good will in so-called civilized or socialized human nature? What can education do toward that end, starting in the nursery and kindergarten, and ending only with death?

What, may I ask bluntly, has religion to suggest by way of answer to this question? To bid us return to the Bible and its God is to reveal a woeful ignorance of the Bible. Let us seriously consider the quintessential teaching of that supposed final authority.

When Jesus was asked by the Pharisees which was the great commandment in the law, he said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and added, "the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets."

Now, what does any one mean in these modern times by the words "Love the Lord thy God"? The naive, primitive, anthropomorphic conception of God is no longer entertained by enlightened persons. God is not a superman. He cannot be imagined as a physical being resembling a tall, handsome, dignified man. To say that God is omniscient, omnipotent, eternal, perfect, etc., is to use words without any definite meaning. To say that God is everywhere is, likewise, to say nothing intelligible and significant. No "being," supreme or not, can be everywhere in space and beyond space, assuming that we can think of any realm beyond space.

Let us not forget St. James' striking comment on Jesus' summary of the whole of the law and the prophets: "If a man say, I love God, and hateth his brother, he is a liar; for he who loveth not his brother, whom he hath seen, how can he love God whom he hath not seen?"

The honest thinker must realize that it is impossible to love something we have not seen, comprehended, known, or imagined. Even if we believe that there is a power, not ourselves, that makes for righteousness, we are bound to admit that that power is inconceivable, unknowable, unthinkable; and such a power cannot be loved.

What we can love and cherish is a standard of human conduct, an ideal, a set of principles, and clearly the love of our neighbor, or of humanity, is the most fundamental of those principles. In other words, the two commandments of Jesus resolve themselves into one, love thy neighbor as thyself. If we do not, as a matter of fact, love our fellow men, then we are liars if we pretend that we do. The anti-Semites, therefore, are liars, as are the haters of Catholics and Negroes.

However, we must be candid in urging or claiming love of our fellows. In Biblical days, particularly in New Testament days, one actually had neighbors, and life was a simple affair. When James declared that "pure religion and undefiled" is "to visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction," he used words that were meant to be taken literally. In belittling faith without works, James and the other evangelists employed the most familiar illustrations, speaking of food and drink, of raiment and shelter. To love one's neighbors was to supply their daily needs. Indifference to such needs was sinful and irreligious. But the inadequacy of such illustrations under the conditions of modern urban life is patent. What would Jesus and his followers say to our industrial barons, our financiers and speculators, our business executives, our multimillionaires? What would they say to our advertisers, our editors, our columnists? What would be their opinion of the *laissez-faire* theory of economics and government?

The truth is that the gospel rewritten in modern terms, terms appropriate to modern life, would be extremely unpalatable to the majority of the privileged and well-to-do groups. What do our churches and synagogues say to these powerful groups with reference to such problems as collective bargaining, social security, full employment, private monopoly, corporate finance? The question, alas, answers itself, and the answer convicts the great majority of churchgoers of conscious and unconscious hypocrisy. St. James would have to call them liars!

But candor will not stop here. Does science justify

the command to love our fellow men as ourselves? Does experience warrant the belief in the possibility of this kind of love? If not, why demand the impossible of human nature? Such a demand may, for a time, result in mere lip service. Preach to people love of the neighbor, as the Christian churches have done for nearly two thousand years, and they will profess to agree with you, but they will be bored and lukewarm. Five minutes after the sermon they will forget it, and go about their business, recreation, or avocations in customary fashion. Why, then, persist in self-deception? Why cling to the pretense that the so-called religion of love has been in any degree a vital force in life, save in very few individual cases?

Intellectual rectitude calls for earnest reconsideration of the terms of Christian ethics. For the term "love" in Jesus' second commandment we had better substitute the term justice. The obligation to be decent, or just, to one's neighbors or fellow men is recognized by many who know they do not and cannot love, or even like, all their neighbors. We love but few; but we can be just even to those we treat with complete indifference, nay, even to those we rather dislike. Justice, to be sure, is not enough under all circumstances, but what an improvement simple justice alone would effect in contemporary human society! Why not work, then, for the more moderate and practical ideal of justice? Injustice arouses indignation. The "categorical imperative" of our conscience dictates just dealing; it does *not* dictate love.

It may be added, however, that while working and fighting for simple justice in human relations, we might also stress the high desirability of two other qualities, mercy and humility. Micah, it will be remembered, included these in his noble formula. We can be merciful and charitable to those we do not love. We can be humble without losing dignity and self-respect. We *are* humble if we stop to think of our ignorance, our lapses and failures, our hypocrisies.

This, then, should be the program of scientific and philosophical Humanism: Justice for all, the suppression of brutality and cruelty (for example, the abolition of capital punishment), the elimination of all special privileges, the restoration of equality of economic opportunity and the unscrambling of bloated monopolies, the removal of the menace and fear of undeserved poverty, the extension and development of social security.

Here is a program for which all humane and civilized persons can work together with but little discord and friction. It is a sufficiently inspiring and far-from-easy program. The emotion of love is no part of the necessary equipment of any United Front dedicated to its realization. It is a realistic program and it can be presented in realistic, honest terms.

The truly religious people should welcome the opportunity of discarding the hollow, empty, ghostly elements of their creed and vocabulary. We do not want words and outworn superstitions. We want deeds. We want assurance of gradual moral progress toward the good life and the good society.

Observations on Europe

DEVERE ALLEN

American success in Western Europe is not well served by those who persist in putting policy within the framework of war, or force short of war. Only a few weeks ago, in Paris, a distinguished observer declared: "You Americans, so far away, seem more afraid of war than we are." But the sharpening of conflict at Flushing Meadows has increased European jitters. When an American unofficial military journal came up with the judgment that Soviet armies could occupy the entire Continent in forty-eight hours, that single sentence, devoid of qualifying text, was sent through the press of all Europe, and did its part in creating nervous fear. Did it help America or Russia?

Soviet propaganda is trying to convince the European peoples that America plans war, wishes to use dollars as a means of securing dominance over the internal affairs of European countries, and will grant relief of suffering only where this suits political ambitions. The American task is to convince Europeans, by concrete acts which belie these charges, that American concern for Europe is based on no such motives. The task requires first of all sincerity, then skill in approaching European leaders, press, and public. Up to now, American approaches have done too little to dispel suspicion.

Russia's case in the West is constantly strengthened by Moscow's championship of race freedom, workers' culture, and economic planning. These are things a majority of Europeans believe in. So far as America does not believe in them, her job of bringing about European recovery is handicapped. American policy, in any case, should not be directed against these aspects of Soviet life and influence, but unmistakably against totalitarianism and its westward extension.

Sound approaches could work wonders. In France, the Communists are well-organized, brainy, and determined. They have had the inside track with the big trade unions in the cities, and they reach the peasants with an able paper claiming 300,000 readers. But they have been slipping. No longer will the major unions do without question what the Communists desire. The withdrawal of Molotov from the 16-nation survey, the humiliation of the Czechs, Moscow's unwillingness to give France the Saar, the execution of Petkov in Bulgaria despite left-wing protests—all these acts have hurt. The reactionary activities of de Gaulle, plus uncertainty about the aims of America, have shored up Communist prestige when it might more seriously have slumped.

In Italy the Communists have had the advantage of widespread misery, post-war disillusionment, and an ever-widening gap between prices and wages. Yet even so, they have been losing some support. Moscow's veto of United Nations membership offset the opportunistic gains made by Communist recognition of Catholicism as a state religion. With Italians, laughter hurts more than anything, and there has been plenty of merriment over the way in which the Kremlin de-

cided to ratify the Italian peace treaty, while its spokesman at Rome, Togliatti, appeared in print several days after with strident demands that the treaty be rejected.

American prestige is undermined by unjust criticisms of Europe, together with partisan maneuvering by top politicians in the States. Glib voices saying that "Europeans just won't get together" seem unwarranted to nations which frankly concede their faults, but which have been making the effort of a lifetime to meet American demands. Some Americans seem to fancy that European countries have little more to do to unite on economic programs than if they were so many states of the American Union. On the contrary, the wartime experiences of the various lands were vastly different; some are agrarian and others industrial; most suffer from wornout machinery, depleted transport, perpetual shortages of raw materials. A crisis can often foster the will to become cooperative, but it can hardly produce the physical capacity to realize, speedily, the most cooperative aims.

Europe has done well in certain ways, the many difficulties considered. *Time* speaks of the way Britain "frittered away" the United States loan. But price rises in America frittered away nearly 40 per cent. If you break down the balance-of-payment figures, you learn that instead of the alleged failure in production, the British doubled their exports to the United States last year, while of every two dollars earned by exports, one dollar went for food and supplies sent to Germany. That was war, not shiftlessness. To Britain, Americans owe much of the most constructive planning in the report of the 16 nations at Paris, and it was not only America but Britain which insisted on as much self-help as possible.

Italian industry is already at 60 per cent of its prewar level, but it can find none of the old markets in Eastern Europe and Germany. Electric power is even greater than it was in 1938. There is hard work, not only in Italy, but in much of Europe. Out of the trade talks at Geneva, a fair amount of cooperation has emerged; of 108 agreements scheduled, 56 have even now been consummated. France and Italy, inspired by the example of Belgium, Luxembourg, and the Netherlands, have undertaken to tackle the job of creating a customs union. Countries which never even dreamed of such a thing before are now saying that they will do what they can to build up an eventual comprehensive customs union—an extremely difficult goal even under the most favorable conditions.

What terrifies Europe is American callousness and confusion in high places. Secretary Marshall's intelligent leadership for Western European rehabilitation is too often, and too easily, frustrated by indifference and downright misrepresentation. No utterance of recent times has so shocked Europeans as the statement by Harold Stassen, the reputed "liberal," that no aid should be given unless nationalization of industry be dropped—in countries where nationalization, strong controls and detailed planning are deemed by overwhelming majorities to be the sole means of national survival. One wonders what Stassen would have done about the British railroads, which for twenty years have paid such infinitesimal dividends to stockholders that it became impossible to raise capital by subscription, so that equipment was kept rolling only through repeated grants from the Treasury.

Do Americans agree with David Lawrence of *United States News* when he treats the European crisis as "propaganda," lumps democratic Socialism with Communism, sees exports to Europe as the exclusive cause of high U. S. prices, and tells workers who have labored for years on deficient diets that they must work harder or Americans will refuse to help them in their time of trouble? The choice for Europeans between such ignorance and the hollow blandishments of Moscow is a bitter one. Is there no better alternative for a great nation like America to offer? The French paper, *Aux Ecoutes* (At the Listening Posts), when the French people were at their most desperate, printed a cartoon showing John Bull and Marianne holding out their hats to Uncle Sam in humble supplication. But Uncle Sam, prosperously dressed and not to be fooled, replies so very, very courteously: "Remain covered, I pray you."

In Western Europe the sound procedures would be these: send stopgap aid promptly; put through the Marshall Plan as fast as feasible, which does not preclude reasonable safeguards to see that it is wisely spent; stop talking self-righteously; and,, above all, cease using the European emergency as political capital for the nominating conventions of next summer. When it comes to Eastern Europe, however, a successful American policy involves patience, an end to defeatism, some definite reversals, and a deeper understanding of advantages which could be seized but which are now being lost.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 102)

Article VII. Everyone, in the determination of his rights and obligations, is entitled to a fair hearing before an independent and impartial tribunal and to the aid of counsel. No one shall be convicted or punished for crime except after public trial pursuant to law in effect at the time of the commission of the act charged. Everyone, regardless of office or status, is subject to the rule of law.

Article VIII. Everyone has the right to a nationality. Everyone has a right to take an effective part in his government directly or through his representatives, and to participate in elections, which shall be periodic, free, and by secret ballot.

Article IX. Everyone has the right to a decent living, to work, and advance his well-being, to health, education, and social security. There shall be equal opportunity for all to participate in the economic and cultural life of the community.

Article X. Everyone, everywhere in the world, is entitled to the human rights and fundamental freedoms set forth in this declaration without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion. The full exercise of these rights requires recognition of the rights of others and protection by law of the freedom, general welfare, and security of all.

—*The Progressive Miner.*

The Study Table

Civil Rights

To Secure These Rights. *The Report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. New York: Simon & Schuster. 178 pp. $1.00.*

I have just read what is probably the most important government document of our time. This report was prepared by a most distinguished and representative committee of fifteen members. The chairman was Charles E. Wilson, President of the General Electric Company, certainly one of the leading industrialists of our country. It is a sort of official government appendix to Myrdal's great work *The American Dilemma,* and should be read by every American.

This Committee believes in Americans and that "they cherish freedom and want to see it protected and extended." Says Mr. Wilson in his Foreword: "We have done our honest best to deal with long-standing and perplexing questions. We ask only a fair hearing, and a serious discussion of our proposals in the nation's cities, towns, and hamlets."

The report begins with a warm and eloquent chapter on "The American Heritage: the Promise of Freedom and Equality." The ideals of Americans are religious ideals—based on the importance of the individual, every individual. So, the first chapter says: "We can tolerate no restrictions upon the individual which depend upon irrelevant factors such as his race, his color, his religion, or the social position to which he was born."

The Committee then takes up certain rights:

1. The right to safety and security of the person.
2. The right to citizenship and its privileges.
3. The right to freedom of conscience and expression.
4. The right to equal opportunity.

Under the right of opportunity it names employment, education, housing, public services and accommodations—and by chapter and verse shows that our "record is short of the goal." Its examples refer to Mexicans, Spanish-speaking people of the Southwest, Indians, Negroes, Orientals, and white people discriminate against them all. The Committee has a long section on "Segregation Reconsidered"—and comes out against segregation of all kinds. It says that the South's policy of "separate but equal" is a failure. "It brands the Negro with the mark of inferiority and asserts he is not fit to associate with white people," and concludes:

> No argument or rationalization can alter this basic fact: A law which forbids a group of American citizens to associate with other citizens in the ordinary course of daily living creates inequality by imposing a Caste Status on the minority group.

The report is definitely against Jim Crow schools and hospitals, against quotas in colleges and restrictive covenants. It cites Chicago as a bad example with 80 per cent of its land blighted by restrictive covenants.

The report calls upon the government to end segregation in the armed forces and in all the departments of government. There is a special section deploring the situation in the nation's capital—a blot on our proud heritage where all the world can see it. A very simple example is the annual marble tournament in Washington. Of course, the Negroes and whites play separately. Without a contest between the white winner and the Negro winner, the white boy is declared champion and the Negro runner-up. Yet, even in Washington, we tell the boys "Play fair," "Be good sports." This *government report* says: "The United States can no longer countenance these burdens on its common conscience, these inroads on its moral fiber."

James M. Yard.

Priceless Document

Abraham Lincoln's Autobiography. *By Robert Dale Richardson. Boston: The Beacon Press. 45 pp. $1.50.*

This volume is a brief but authoritative account of the origin and use of the priceless three-page autobiography of Abraham Lincoln, which was written by his own hand at the instance of Jesse W. Fell in 1859, and which was used as source material by the Hon. Joseph J. Lewis of Pennsylvania in his introduction of Lincoln to the American public prior to the 1860 election. The manuscript was returned to Jesse W. Fell in 1872, and finally came into the possession of Robert Dale Richardson, a descendant of Fell, who presented the precious pages to the Library of Congress. Fell, a close friend of Lincoln, was active in securing Lincoln's nomination for the Presidency. He was of Hicksite Quaker background, a liberal Christian, and one of the founders of the Unitarian Church in Bloomington. He often discussed religious matters with Lincoln. And in a letter to Ward H. Lamon, in 1872, Fell stated that Theodore Parker was the "author whose views most nearly represented" those of Lincoln on the subject of religion. But Mr. Richardson makes no effort to claim Lincoln as a Unitarian. He says: "It must be stated emphatically, even at this late date, that Lincoln was not a member of any church."

Curtis W. Reese.

Horror, Heroism, and Haven

The Other Kingdom. *By David Rousset. New York: Reynal & Hitchcock. 173 pp. $2.75.*

Blessed is the Match. *By Marie Syrkin. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 361 pp. $3.50.*

Smoke Over Birkenau. *By Seweryna Szmaglewska. Translated by Jadwiga Rynas. New York: Henry Holt & Co. 386 pp. $3.50.*

Refugees in America. *By Maurice R. Davie. New York: Harper & Bros. 453 pp. $4.50.*

In *The Other Kingdom,* a French journalist describes life in the German concentration camps where he himself had spent sixteen months. Already the world seems to be forgetting, all-too conveniently, what the "concentrationary universe," as Rousset calls it, meant to the Germans and to their victims: to the Aryan *Uebermensch* to whom this instrument of fiendish sadism and bestial cruelty became the supreme proof of his superiority, and to "the lesser breed without the law" that was compelled to bare its body and soul to the most perfectly working torture-machine on a large scale that a perverted human ingenuity has ever devised.

You may not be able to read these pages without a fit of nausea; for there is little here that may be called light or pretty or decent. Hardly aught here meets

the mind but stark brutality, bestial barbarism, and sadism on a gargantuan scale; a chaos of perversity and insanity whose darkness is only rarely relieved by flashes of human dignity and nobility. Yes, this record proves to what depths of utter degradation men may fall; but there are pages when you also realize that human nature at its noblest and best cannot be robbed of its essential divinity even when faced with indignities and humiliation that defy human imagination. Rousset's description of the concentration-camp experiences of himself and comrades may serve a wholesome purpose if it but helps to arouse the conscience of mankind to "remember," not in order to wreak vengeance and to return evil for evil, but to face evil in human nature more frankly and realistically, and with sympathetic understanding to build more strongly the dykes of human intelligence, morality, and idealism against the sinister undercurrents in the human psyche and in human society. If these pages can help achieve such a result, they may well serve as a potent prescription against that spiritual paralysis that seems to be creeping over us, numbing our faculties of memory and initiative. The closing words of the book are significant:

> The existence of the camps is a warning. . . . It would be blindness—and criminal blindness, at that—to believe that, by reason of any difference of national temperament, it would be impossible for any other country to try a similar experiment. Germany interpreted, with an originality in keeping with her history, the crisis that led her to the concentrationary universe. But the existence and the mechanism of that crisis were inherent in the economic and social foundations of capitalism and imperialism. Under a new guise, similar effects may reappear tomorrow. There remains therefore a very specific war to be waged. The lessons learned from the concentration camps provide a marvelous arsenal for that war. And the German anti-Fascists, interned for more than ten years, should be our invaluable comrades in arms in such a fight.

Marie Syrkin opens her story of the Jewish resistance movement in Europe during the recent war with a stirring chapter on "The Parachutists from Palestine." Thirty-two young men and women from the collective settlements of Palestine made up this adventurous group; they had to be, as the author puts it, "spies and heroes, fliers and secret agents; in addition, they had to be saviors—impelled by a special passion to aid their people." Among these thirty-two parachutists was the twenty-two-year-old Hungarian Jewess, Hanna Senesch, the first line of whose poem, "Blessed is the Match," is the title of this book. Hanna Senesch has been called the Joan of Arc of Palestinian Jewry, and her immortality is assured together with that of her comrades and those many nameless ones who fought and died among the smoke and rubble of Warsaw's smashed ghetto. Hanna landed with her parachutist comrades in Yugoslavia in 1944, was captured by the Germans, and executed in a prison in Budapest.

Thus begins Marie Syrkin's story of the tragedy that reduced the number of European Jews by almost six million, a story whose epic sweep and majestic drama will stir the imagination of men as long as men love freedom enough to fight and die for it. The story told in these pages speaks with a simplicity and a naturalness that need no romantic coloration to plead the cause of truth. Here is the revelation of how blind even the German Jews could be towards Hitler's genocidal intents and how their instincts for decency refused almost to the last to believe the terrible fate that was being prepared for them; here is the sorry record of Allied bungling while there was still time to save millions of Jews, of Allied hesitation and ineffectiveness when opportunities for practical aid did present themselves; and here finally is the unbelievable account of that last heroic effort of a cornered people seeking with every means of despair to save what might still be saved from certain doom or at least to sell their lives as dearly as possible.

The story of the Battle of the Warsaw Ghetto has been touchingly fictionalized by Pierre Van Paassen in the closing pages of *Earth Could Be Fair*. Marie Syrkin tells this story in her direct and convincing manner, and when you close the book, you know that you have come face to face with tragedy and heroism as they have rarely been recorded. How the resistance movement, begun in Europe under the most forbidding conditions, did its desperate and often so successful work; how it came to Palestine, was there taken over by the Haganah, how it developed into the "Ha'apalah," i.e. the illegal immigration movement which today is compelling the nations of the world to come to terms with the problem of Palestine and the DP's,—this is the subject matter of the closing chapters and also the beginning of a chapter yet to be written, let us hope, in terms of less horror, less unnecessary sacrifice, and of more intelligence and moral responsibility. The story of Jewish resistance and the Jewish underground has been gloriously immortalized in these pages. Marie Syrkin has here raised "a monument more enduring than brass" for Hanna Senesch and all her brave Jewish compatriots to whose service and sacrifice thousands owe their lives and millions will owe their new existence in a free Palestine. This book will also remain a stern reminder to future generations of how men can do too little too late, and thereby destroy not only millions of their fellow men but their own souls and consciences as well.

Seweryna Szmaglewska was a student in the University of Warsaw when in 1939 the war broke out in Poland. She at once joined the Polish underground, was arrested in 1942 and sent to Birkenau, one of the most dreaded of horror-camps maintained by the Nazis. She says in her Foreword:

> My story tells of only one fragment of the gigantic machine of death that was Oswiecim. I will give only the data of what I observed or what I myself endured directly. The events described by me took place in Birkenau (Oswiecim II) . . . I do not intend in any way to exaggerate the importance of the facts or to change them for propaganda's sake. Some things need no exaggeration. . . . These are the experiences and observations of one person alone—a drop in the vast, immeasurable ocean. Without doubt there will be others who return alive from Oswiecim and who will talk. There will be others who will come back from many other camps. But the majority will never return and will never talk.

And the reader will be grateful that among those to come back and talk was the author of *Smoke Over Birkenau*. Her story is a passionate indictment of the brutality and inhumanity released by the Nazis upon a dumfounded and confused world, an indictment of a policy of destruction and annihilation the total effect of which we are even today unable to evaluate completely. There may be little joy in reading such a book, but its reading may also become a stern duty; for what Seweryna Szmaglewska here relates needs to be told. Her book is, in the last analysis, a social document as well as a personal story, proving the extreme lengths to which tyrants will go as well as the power of that inner core of noble humanity that

makes it possible for men and women, old and young, to survive a Birkenau.

Refugees in America is the report of the Committee for the Study of Recent Immigration from Europe, done by Prof. Maurice R. Davie, Chairman of the Department of Sociology at Yale University, and a corps of able colleagues. The volume is "a record of the great mass migration of our time" and tells the story of the flight of the thousands of Europeans who have sought refuge in America from political and religious persecution. One wonders whether the eightieth Congress might not have dealt more intelligently with the Stratton Bill if every one of its members had been presented with a copy of this book before voting on the problem of Europe's displaced persons.

How well we know the questions that agitate the mind of America as regards recent immigration to our shores and the problem as to whether we should open our doors to further groups of refugees and immigrants. Here are some of the most common and popular questions that are always being asked: How many of our recent immigrants have been refugees? To what nationalities and religious groups do they belong? How have our immigration laws functioned during this period, and how have they been administered? Where have the refugees settled? How have they adjusted themselves to American life? What do they think of Americans? What do Americans think of them? What is their attitude towards assimilation? Do they intend to remain or to return? What effect have they had on American society? What contributions have they made to our culture and economy? Have they been an asset or a liability to this country? Here are authoritative answers to these questions based on careful and scholarly research and interpretation of facts and figures, plus valuable material in the form of illustrative maps, charts, and pictures.

This is undoubtedly the most comprehensive study ever made of recent immigration to these shores in all its pertinent aspects, and anyone interested in helping answer some of the questions given above and in solving the further question as to America's part in the world's obligation towards those that are compelled to seek a new home will find here a veritable encyclopedia of knowledge and information.

KARL M. CHWOROWSKY.

Introducing Emily

INTRODUCTION TO EMILY DICKINSON. *By Henry W. Wells. Chicago: Packard and Company. 286 pp. $3.00.*

The output of books about Emily Dickinson is continuous and never-ending. Most of the books about her, however, have been biographical or purely legendary and fictitious. Professor Wells' book strikes a new path: an attempt to interpret her poetry in the light of literary history. This attempt is long overdue. The telling and retelling of the myths about her has become utterly futile. Most of the traditions endlessly retold are utterly without foundation in fact. It is curious that such a vast amount of legendary material could have grown up about so recent a writer. Abraham Lincoln is the only modern parallel.

The facts of Emily's life are few and simple. She was born in Amherst of a staunch New England family, and after pursuing a literary career for fifty-six years she died and was buried in the town of her birth. She had all the traits of her contemporary writers, Hawthorne, Thoreau, Helen Hunt Jackson, Melville, and Emerson, but she resembled Emerson more than any other. She was always intensely studious, even to the point of revolt against the routine of Mount Holyoke College which interfered with her higher pursuits. She traveled about as widely as Emerson and if she had been a man she probably would have been a lecturer. She was insufferably bored with the small talk of Amherst and retired to her study. She was not a recluse in the legendary sense at all, she merely preferred her poetry to the gossip of her neighbors. She realized that her poetry would make her famous after her death, for she was as much ahead of her time as was Emerson.

Emily was a devout disciple of the seventeenth century; and on the literature of that period, including the King James Bible, she patterned the greater part of all she wrote. Even her legendary lovers go back to the pattern of that earlier period. How she would laugh if she could read some of the books and see the plays that try to explain her lovers. The absurdity of all these interpretations is instantly clear when we understand Emily in relation to her chosen period of time. She so loved the seventeenth century that she even copied in her own peculiar handwriting some of the poetry of George Herbert by way of memorizing it as she worked in her garden. Long afterward, this fragment was found among her papers, and one of her editors innocently printed it as one of her own poems. How Emily would laugh again.

Most of these things Professor Wells sees clearly. According to the conviction of this reviewer, however, he underestimates the influence of John Donne and slightly underestimates the influence of the entire seventeenth century. "Influences," of course, are always difficult to trace, and Professor Wells justly finds them in her blood rather than verbatim on her page. Emily was even more adroit than Shakespeare in her use of sources. The seventeenth century to her was vital and meaningful for the most part. The nineteenth century in New England, however, seemed futile with its unnecessary Civil War and its utter lack of vision. She saw, even more clearly than did Thoreau, the confusion and chaos that were coming. She expressed all this in symbolism, even as did Melville.

It is to be hoped that Professor Wells' book will set the fashion for the next several years' research about Emily. We have had enough fictionized biography. We need a new edition of her letters including those hitherto unpublished. This reviewer has been for some time searching for the "lost" correspondence of Emily and her lifelong friend, Helen Hunt Jackson, whose fame is also steadily increasing. There yet remain many manuscripts and letters which, when published, will throw new light on America's prophetic poets. It is also to be hoped that in the not too distant future there may be two depositaries of manuscripts of great value to students of American literature: one at Amherst College for Emily's distinctly New England work, and one at Colorado College for the manuscripts dealing with Emily's wider outreach and her relationships with Helen Hunt Jackson.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Western Conference News

RANDALL S. HILTON, Executive Secretary
700 Oakwood Boulevard, Chicago 15, Illinois

VIEWPOINTS

IF LIBERALS AROUND THE WORLD COULD UNITE,
What common thoughts could they think?
What common language could they speak?
What common action could they take?

E. T. Buehrer, Chicago.

NEEDS FOR HAPPINESS AND HEALTH

There are two indispensable requirements for happiness and health:

The first requirement is that we must learn to live in a personal world. Not the world of politics or sociology, international relations or theology, reform or revolution, economics, atoms or electrons, but the world of persons is the domain of happiness. For the seeker after happiness nothing about the growth and struggle of a national state is as important as the growth and struggle of a person. We must learn to live first of all in quick responsiveness to persons immediately around us.

The second requirement is that we must learn to confer happiness upon, to do good to, other persons. For all the peril involved in that effort, there is no way out of it. A passive or neutral life is nothing. Our interest in persons, our devotedness to them, must have free and even energetic expression in a life of doing them good whenever we can.

John W. Cyrus, Omaha.

TODAY'S NEED

These words are addressed only to those who feel a deep inner need, inexplicable, but very real.

There is a malady today which is sweeping over the world. It has little to do with political questions, foreign policy, economic dislocation, but is more subtle, more deeply personal.

It cannot be segregated, and no one seems to be immune. All of us today are struck, and struck hard by a kind of spiritual lag. We lose our appetite for living and the zest goes out of things.

The malady itself is as unknown as its cure. There seems little to do but to let it run its darkening course.

It is easy to say "try religion," or read a certain book, or stop reading the papers. This may help but not cure. Someday there will be restoration, as surely as there is restitution.

In the meantime, you need the church—not to "get religion" but to get fellowship. Come not to be seen of men, but to see men—people like yourself. Be a part of something greater than yourself, and be assured of the essential humanity of it all. This is something—this is enough for now.

Harold P. Marley, Dayton.

BASIC SECURITY

Basically our problem of economic security begins with ourselves. It is not simply one of balancing a budget; it depends upon our scale of values. What is it we want most in life—possession and prestige, or a condition of mental balance which rests on the soundness of our life itself? Whatever our income, $2,500 or $25,000, we can still be tortured by economic worries if we have not made this decision.

We must continuously make the effort to understand ourselves, our abilities and possibilities, and plan life realistically by what is there. "Hitch your wagon to a star!", cried Emerson, but it is a bit wiser to choose something smaller and nearer at hand that will not scorch your wings when you try to fly.

For neither in any perfect economic system the world might turn to, nor in any revision of the one we have is there any possibility of escaping the necessity to choose our wants according to what is possible and what can give the most enduring, spiritual satisfactions.

Robert T. Weston, Louisville.

APPEASEMENT

Our generation must not allow the word appeasement to fall into disrepute, for often appeasement is reasonable good sense. It is good sense when two opponents asserting the "will to power" would otherwise clash with stubbornness.

There is an appeasement which is valid. It is oil on turbulent waters which permits rescue from a sinking ship. It is a quiet voice amidst discordant disagreement. It is strength asserting itself in ways recognized as: confidence in faith, as when a physician enters the room where frightened parents hover over their sick child; courage standing firmly with a friend as when a wordless handclasp more than balances the charges of gossip. It is love in action which by some alchemy of the spirit brings peace in heart and in mind.

Arthur W. Olsen, Toledo.

FREEDOM?

The firing of a liberal editor of *The Christian Register* for "non-cooperation" is a policy of subordinating editorial responsibility to the interests of denominational promotion, like the firing of the president of a state university for holding an American view of academic freedom. It serves to discredit in each case the institution where the suppression occurs.

I fully realize that my position is likely to be misunderstood, especially by those interested in "promoting" Unitarianism through a publicity campaign. Their enterprise is grotesque and impossible. You can "promote" doctrines, but cannot "promote" freedom. Freedom is not a group of dogmas, but a method. You "promote" some of the ideas that free minds once produced but the freedom that gave birth to the thought cannot be "promoted." Freedom is only advanced by courageous, unfettered minds allowed to work at the problems of religion and society with the seeming contradictions and dangers which are always present where thinking is going on.

"Promoted" doctrines can be made to look like freedom, but are better for their resemblance only as skillful counterfeits are superior to clumsy ones. The present *Register* does not even look like a Unitarian journal, but if it did, it would not raise my respect for the imitation of free thought. One of the most discouraging factors in the present welter of misunderstanding is the number of people who are content with a shallow semblance.

John G. Gill, Alton.

NEWS NOTES

Secretary's Schedule—1947

Jan. 6-9: Boston, Board Meetings.
Jan. 11: Chicago Student Council.
Jan. 12: Third Church, Chicago, Annual Meeting.
Jan. 15: People's Liberal Church, Chicago, U.U.A.
Jan. 18: Exec. Committee, Chicago Unitarian Council.
Jan. 19: Adult Discussion Group, First Church, Chicago.
Jan. 25: Chicago Unitarian Youth Council.
Jan. 26: Quincy, Illinois.
Feb. 2: First Church, Chicago.
Feb. 3-5: Iowa Ministers Seminar, Iowa City.
Feb. 10: Western Conference Board Meeting.
Feb. 13: Minneapolis.
Feb. 16: Chicago Unitarian Council.
Feb. 21-25: St. Louis, Missouri.
Mar. 9-13: Boston, Board Meetings.
Mar. 15: Chicago Area Council, A.U.Y.
Mar. 30: Geneva, Illinois.
Apr. 3: Chicago Laymen's Meeting.
Apr. 4-6: Minneapolis.
Apr. 7-9: Unitarian-Universalist Ministers' Retreat.
Apr. 19: Chicago Area Council, A.U.Y.
May 9-11: Western Conference, Annual Meetings.
May 18-23: May Meetings, Boston.
June 1: Cleveland, Ohio.
June 4: Milwaukee, Laymen's League.
July 2: Davenport, Ia. (Pulpit Committee.)
Aug. 25-Sept. 1: Lake Geneva Conference.
Sept. 5-7: Cincinnati, Ohio, First Church.
Sept. 9: Hinsdale, Illinois, Board Meeting.
Sept. 11-13: Minnesota Conference.
Sept. 28: People's Liberal Church, Chicago.
Oct. 5: Hinsdale, Illinois.
Oct. 12: Cleveland, Ohio.
Oct. 13-17: General Conference, Washington, D. C.
Oct. 19: Cincinnati, Ohio, St. Johns.
Oct. 29: Urbana, Illinois, Board Meeting.
Oct. 31-Nov. 2: Iowa Association, Des Moines.
Nov. 9: Detroit, Michigan.
Nov. 16: Denver, Colorado.
Nov. 20: Colorado Springs.
Nov. 23: Wichita, Kansas.
Nov. 25: Kansas City, Missouri.
Dec. 1-2: Geneva Conference Board Meeting.
Dec. 7: Free Religious Association, Chicago.
Dec. 14: Geneseo, Illinois.
Dec. 21: Shelbyville, Illinois.
Dec. 29-30: Meadville Theological School, Ministers' Meetings.

RADIO PROGRAMS

The following Western Conference churches or their ministers are conducting regular radio broadcasts:

Denver, Colorado—Rudolph Gilbert.
Sioux City, Iowa—John W. Brigham.
Des Moines, Iowa—Grant Butler.
Cedar Rapids, Iowa—Waldemar Argow.
Madison, Wisconsin—Kenneth L. Patton.
Indianapolis, Indiana—E. Burdette Backus.
Ft. Wayne, Indiana—Aron Gilmartin.
Dayton, Ohio—Harold P. Marley.

UNITARIAN-UNIVERSALIST MERGER?

Both the Unitarians and the Universalists at their General Conferences this past fall adopted resolutions looking toward closer cooperation and possible merger between these two liberal religious bodies. Dr. Leslie T. Pennington, minister of the First Unitarian Society, Chicago, was appointed Chairman of the Unitarian Committee. Other Western Conference men serving on this Committee are Dr. Tracy Pullman, Detroit, and Dr. Wallace W. Robbins, President of Meadville Theological School.

A joint Unitarian-Universalist Committee has been appointed for the Greater Chicago Area. The Universalist members are: Rev. William J. Arms, Peoria; Dr. Walter H. MacPherson, Joliet; and Rev. Walter Stevens, Hoopston, Illinois. The Unitarian members are: Dr. Curtis W. Reese, Chairman, Dr. Wallace W. Robbins, and Rev. Randall S. Hilton.

Reports from the national committee indicate very little progress has been made. The Midwest Committee is making plans for a general exchange of pulpits among the Unitarian and Universalist ministers. One such exchange has already taken place between Mr. Arms of Peoria and Dr. Backus of Indianapolis.

MINISTERS' RETREAT

The annual Unitarian-Universalist Ministers' Retreat, or perhaps better called "Institute," is being planned for April 5 to 9. It will be held again this year at Marquette State Park, Grafton, Illinois. Dr. Merrill Bush, Director of the Department of Adult Education and Social Relations of the American Unitarian Association, will be the leader for the Unitarians. The Universalist leader has not yet been announced. The Committee in charge of arrangements is Randall S. Hilton, Chairman; Philip Schug, Lincoln, Nebraska; John Q. Parkhurst, Oak Park, Illinois; and William J. Arms, Peoria.

LAKE GENEVA CONFERENCE FILMS

Color films showing the activities of the Midwest Unitarian Summer Assembly held at College Camp (on Lake Geneva), Wisconsin, last summer are now available on request. Arrangements for their use can be made through the Western Unitarian Conference office.

These pictures (16mm. silent movie) were taken by Mr. J. G. Princell of St. Louis. The scenario was written by the Drama Workshop under the leadership of Waldemar Argow of Cedar Rapids. They give a beautiful and accurate picture of life at Geneva. They not only stimulate interest in the Conference for next summer but can be used as a means of helping to raise scholarship funds for sending delegates to Geneva.

The Geneva Conference next summer will meet from August 22-29, 1948, at the same place, College Camp.

AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION

The annual meetings of the American Humanist Association will be held in Chicago, February 17-18. Among the speakers will be: Dr. H. Hutton Hynd, St. Louis Ethical Society; Dr. Gerald Wendt, Editor of *Science Illustrated;* Edwin H. Wlison, Salt Lake City; and Dr. Curtis W. Reese.

The meetings will be held at the Central Y.W.C.A., 59 East Monroe Street, Chicago, Tuesday night, February 17, and all day Wednesday, the 18th.

W.U.C. BOARD MEETING

The Board of the Western Unitarian Conference will meet in Chicago, Monday, February 16. Anyone having suggestions for the consideration of the board should send them to the Conference office immediately.